

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

By the present amendment, Applicant amends claims 1 and 9-11. Claims 1 and 7-17 are all the claims pending in the Application. Claims 1 and 7-17 have been rejected.

The present Amendment addresses each point of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Formalities

The Examiner has not yet indicated whether the Formal Drawings filed on September 26, 2003 are accepted. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge and approve the aforementioned Formal Drawings.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 7-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0020693 (hereinafter “Nashida”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for *at least* the independent reasons stated below.

According to the MPEP, “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” (MPEP § 2131). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 7-17 positively recite limitations which are not disclosed (or suggested) by Nashida.

By way of general overview, as explained in the present specification, according to one exemplary embodiment of the present invention, the connections between of the AV Amplifier 1 and the VCR 7, DVR 4 and PDP 3 are set by a user using a remote control device 8. As such, once the connection information is registered by an operator with the remote control device 8, it

is easy for the user to control switching input and output information signals of the VCR 7, DVR 4 and PDP 3 by using the remote control device 8. Indeed, the user does not have to check the connection information by viewing the connectors. These exemplary technical features of the present invention are completely different than the disclosure provided by Nashida, as explained in detail below.

A. Independent Claim 1

First, for example, independent claim 1 recites (among other things):

...a remote control operating unit having:
an input device for inputting, from an
operator, connection information...

The grounds of rejection allege that the external input/output controller 2012 of the image display apparatus 20, disclosed in Nashida, corresponds to an “input device for inputting,” as claimed. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Nashida’s external input/output controller 2012, which is relied upon by the grounds of rejection, cannot possibly correspond to “a remote control operating unit having... an input device,” as claimed. Quite to the contrary, Nashida plainly teaches that the external input/output controller 2012 is a component of the image display apparatus 20. Indeed, no aspect of Nashida discloses or suggests that the remote controller 10 has the external input/output controller 2012, as required by claim 1. Therefore, Nashida fails to disclose, and cannot possibly suggest, the feature of “a remote control operating unit having... an input device,” as recited in claim 1, and claim 1 is not anticipated by Nashida for *at least* these reasons.

Second, independent claim 1 further recites:

a remote control operating unit having:

an input device for inputting, from an operator, connection information which indicates information reproduction equipment connected to information processing equipment...

As mentioned above, the grounds of rejection allege that the external input/output controller 2012 of the image display apparatus 20, disclosed in Nashida, corresponds to an “input device,” as claimed. However, amended claim 1 recites the feature of an input device for inputting connection information which indicates information reproduction equipment connected to information processing equipment.

No aspect of Nashida discloses, or even remotely suggests, that the external input/output controller 2012 of the image display apparatus 20 inputs connection information which indicates the first displaying unit 1006¹ connected to the first communicator 1002,² as required by claim 1. In fact, Nashida discloses quite the opposite—that the external input/output controller 2012 of the image display apparatus 20 interfaces a reception of an output signal from or to an external apparatus, which is a television tuner, a video recorder, a video camera, a radio or a personal computer. Paragraph 0070. Since Nashida fails to disclose or suggest the feature of an input device for inputting connection information which indicates information reproduction equipment connected to information processing equipment, as claimed, claim 1 is not anticipated by Nashida for *at least* these additional reasons.

Third, independent claim 1 also requires:

¹ The grounds of rejection allege that the first displaying unit 1006 corresponds to the recited “information reproduction equipment.”

² The grounds of rejection allege that the first communicator 1002 corresponds to the recited “information processing equipment.”

a remote control operating unit having:
an input device for inputting, from an
operator, connection information... ..via a
connector that is included in the information
processing equipment...

As already discussed, the grounds of rejection allege that the external input/output controller 2012 of the image display apparatus 20, disclosed in Nashida, corresponds to the claimed “input device.” However, amended claim 1 plainly requires the feature of an input device for inputting connection information via a connector that is included in the information processing equipment.

Nashida fails to disclose or suggest that the external input/output controller 2012 of the image display apparatus 20 is for inputting connection information via a connector that is included in the first communicator 1002.³ Consequently, claim 1 is not anticipated by Nashida for *at least* these additional reasons. Further, Applicant submits that claims 7-8 and 15-17 are allowable *at least* by virtue of their dependency on Nashida. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

B. Independent Claim 9

In view of the similarity between the requirements of claim 9 and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 demonstrate the patentability of claim 9. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is

³ The grounds of rejection allege that the first communicator 1002 corresponds to the recited “information processing equipment.”

patentably distinguishable over the cited Nashida reference *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Thus, the allowance of this claim is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

C. Independent Claim 10

In view of the similarity between the requirements of claim 10 and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 demonstrate the patentability of claim 10. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over the cited Nashida reference *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Thus, the allowance of this claim is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

D. Independent Claim 11

In view of the similarity between the requirements of claim 11 and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 demonstrate the patentability of claim 11. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over the cited Nashida reference *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Further, Applicant submits that claims 12-14 are allowable *at least* by virtue of their dependency. Thus, the allowance of these claims is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Andrew J. Taska/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 15, 2007

Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666